

the weather—everybody talks about it but nobody ever does anything about it.

A lot of politicians talk a good game—when they are back home—about bringing Federal deficits and the Federal debt under control. But just look at how so many of these same politicians so regularly voted in support of bloated spending bills that roll through the Senate. The American people took note of that on November 8.

As of Friday, January 8, at the close of business, the Federal debt stood—down to the penny—at exactly \$4,802,133,808,513.71. This debt, remember, was run up by the Congress of the United States.

The Founding Fathers decreed that the big-spending bureaucrats in the executive branch of the U.S. Government should never be able to spend even a dime unless and until the spending had been authorized and appropriated by the U.S. Congress.

The U.S. Constitution is quite specific about that, as every school boy is supposed to know.

And do not be misled by declarations by politicians that the Federal debt was run up by some previous President or another, depending on party affiliation. Sometimes you hear false claims that Ronald Reagan ran it up; sometimes they play hit-and-run with George Bush.

These buck-passing declarations are false, as I said earlier, because the Congress of the United States is the culprit. The Senate and the House of Representatives are the big spenders.

Mr. President, most citizens cannot conceive of a billion of anything, let alone a trillion. It may provide a bit of perspective to bear in mind that a billion seconds ago, Mr. President, the Cuban missile crisis was in progress. A billion minutes ago, the crucifixion of Jesus Christ had occurred not long before.

Which sort of puts it in perspective, does it not, that Congress has run up this incredible Federal debt totaling 4,802 of those billions—of dollars. In other words, the Federal debt, as I said earlier, stood this morning at four trillion, 802 billion, 133 million, 808 thousand, 513 dollars, and 71 cents. It'll be even greater at closing time today.

#### ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, this morning I had the privilege of attending the 76th annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation in St. Louis, MO.

As my colleagues know, the American Farm Bureau is the largest farm organization in America, with over 4.4 million members nationwide. While in St. Louis, I met with both Kansas and American Farm Bureau members as they discussed issues of importance to agriculture and to all Americans.

The theme of this year's meeting is "The Spirit Grows." I believe that their theme reflects the spirit we have seen in America during the last few months. A growing spirit to change America and to bring common sense back to Government. Like most Americans, members of the American Farm Bureau want change.

In his opening remarks, Farm Bureau President Dean Kleckner listed seven Farm Bureau goals—goals which many of us here in the Senate share. These include adopting a balanced budget amendment, passing a line-item veto, reducing the capital gains tax, increasing the estate tax exemption, implementing legislation requiring risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis, limiting unfunded mandates, and strengthening private property rights.

Mr. President, I would encourage my colleagues to read the full text of Mr. Kleckner's speech and to take to heart some of the points he makes. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Kleckner's speech be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ANNUAL ADDRESS, AFBF PRESIDENT DEAN KLECKNER

Good morning fellow Farm Bureau members. Welcome to this 76th gathering of the world's largest, greatest, most powerful, most influential farm organization.

Your American Farm Bureau Federation. Once again, your actions, your deeds, your policies benefitted agriculture, America's most important industry.

Through Farm Bureau, 4.4 million families speak with a unified voice. United in Farm Bureau, we implement the policies and get the results that we could not accomplish individually.

As a direct result of your work—our work—U.S. agriculture today is more oriented toward the marketplace. World trade is less subsidized. The sanctity of property rights is more recognized and appreciated. And there is a growing belief that government must lessen its impact on people and their livelihoods.

We are completing a philosophical cycle.

Our nation was founded on a belief in the integrity and common sense of the individual. Yet, over the years, this rock-solid philosophy eroded, evolving to the thought of: "Let government do it." Then to: "Government, do it." The cycle moved a few years ago to: "Should government do it?"

Now, people of all walks of life, all segments of society are answering: "Government should not do it. It is my responsibility."

President Andrew Jackson once said, "When a democracy is in trouble, the remedy is more democracy."

Our democracy may not have been in trouble, but the way voters voiced their demand for positive change by reducing government's presence was encouraging.

Farm Bureau has long championed the worth of the individual. We've stood firm on our philosophies, our policies. We've altered our policies when we recognize that change is needed, \* \* \* But our philosophies? Never.

The basics, the fundamentals, the traditional values that are still rock-solid across the country, Farm Bureau has not wavered. I know sometimes it felt like we were talking to ourselves. The lack of external response sometimes led us to question our-

selves, but we never questioned our values. Now it can be seen that others were listening.

Others harbored the same quiet, solid beliefs—beliefs that never left rural America.

For decades, Farm Bureau was one of a very few organizations that stood up and spoke out for the ideals we believe in, no matter where our position rated in the latest public opinion poll.

Great political change occurred last November. But we saw the bell cow in 1992 when the public clamored for change. At this point, it looks like no more country-club or good-old-boy politics as usual. Public dissatisfaction—really disgust—with the political system and the politicians won't allow it.

People want a return to basic American principles—individual responsibility, common sense, fairness, faith, firmness not forms, a hand up \* \* \* Not a hand out.

Where's the sense in spending billions of Superfund dollars to pay lawyers to talk about cleaning up dirt at a contaminated site? Why spend billions on a welfare system that does not foster an incentive to get off the public dole?

People have told government that a reordering of priorities and spending habits is definitely in order. And that is an order—an order that will be enforced, come next election, if changes—acceptable changes—don't come quickly.

More regulations, more taxation, more restrictions aren't the answer. We don't need consensus, we need conquerors. When will the deep thinkers, but shallow doers, learn? Free enterprise, coupled with religious compassion, works. Government making rules doesn't make change.

Princeton University economists did a study that showed environmental quality quickly starts to improve when individuals' income and investment returns top \$10,000 a year.

That's the exact opposite conclusion of some think-tank talkers who believe economic growth does unavoidable harm to the environment.

In reality, Mexico, Chile, Venezuela and many Pacific Rim countries have surpassed that threshold number and are moving to improve their environments. To see environmental degradation, look to those that were centrally planned—Russia, Poland, the Balkan states. Yet, some scholars still think that progress is a dirty word. Progress is good if we make it good.

Farm Bureau policies depend on the collective wisdom, experience and values of working people throughout this land.

1994 was quite a year for Farm Bureau. It was a year of accomplishments and yet-to-be-finished accomplishments. I want to tell you of a few, to illustrate the great breadth of your farm organization's interests and activities.

All of the efforts, all of the work, all of the strategies are aimed at our two over-riding goals. They are the same two that Farm Bureau has aimed for since we started over 75 years ago. We're working to improve net farm income. And we strive to improve the quality of rural living.

1994 saw the successful completion to two important trade negotiations. Farm Bureau was intensely involved with both. Our Congress passage of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade is a major relief for U.S. agriculture. I was never more proud, more aware of Farm Bureau's influence, than I was last month as I was led down to sit in the front of that big room in Washington, D.C., to watch President Clinton sign the GATT legislation into law.

By signing on to GATT, other countries will have to follow the same trade rules we

do, opening their markets to our commodities. They must begin to reduce tariffs and subsidies. And they must have a sound, scientific reason to restrict imports for health or sanitation reasons.

Ever since the talks began in Uruguay in 1986, Farm Bureau monitored the negotiations, often speaking directly to foreign negotiators, political leaders and farmers.

Farm Bureau has long recognized that one way to improve our income was to increase the markets for our products. America's farmers and ranchers are just too good at what we do. There aren't enough people here in the U.S. to buy all that we can produce. 95 percent of the world's stomachs are outside our borders. New technologies and new products come on stream daily. Clearly, we have to have access to world markets.

Now, with GATT, that access has improved. Not as much as we would have liked, but enough to offer promise of future improvement. The new international trade regulations are clearly a vote of confidence for the American farmer.

1994 saw the signing of the North American Free Trade Agreement which provides freer trade faster than GATT. Initial trade reports bear out the estimates made by supporters that sales would increase and that export-related employment would increase. There is a great sound in the land, but it's not the predicted great sucking sound of lost jobs. It's more of a chomping sound as fanatics are forced to eat their words.

Now, there is talk of expanding NAFTA to include more South American countries, with some people envisioning a Western Hemisphere trade bloc eventually \* \* \* From the Arctic to the Antarctic. Farm Bureau supports continued elimination of trade barriers. We will observe future negotiations as closely as we did the previous ones. They will certainly offer new and different challenges.

We will also continue to promote international understanding and goodwill among farmers the world over. Thirteen state Farm Bureau presidents and I visited China in 1994. What a market \* \* \* One-and-a-quarter billion people, not all as poor as church mice.

They have a middle class of 100 million consumers with money to spend. China is already a major customer of ours, purchasing an average 500 million dollars a year of wheat and 200 million dollars a year of cotton.

The U.S. Ambassador to China stressed to us that China's economic progress must be encouraged. They are the only country that has successfully managed a substantial transformation of its economy from centrally planned to one largely responsive to market forces. And they're doing it under conditions of growing prosperity and rapid economic growth. I believe that these economic changes will hasten political and civic changes, as well. It is an exciting era for trade expansion and Farm Bureau is well situated to continue to work for your interests.

Another major area demanding our time and talents in 1994 was the defense of property rights. Significant gains were made. Much more needs to be done. Throughout our years of struggle, we have pointed out that farmers and ranchers are environmentalists. We have continued to advance our conservation and stewardship practices.

Last year, more than 100 million acres—over one-third of all U.S. cropland, was farmed using residue management or conservation tillage practices. Why? It's environmentally sound. It's economically sensible. Residue decreases soil erosion and water runoff.

Despite the profusion of unplowed lands, we are using less herbicides. We practice in-

tegrated pest management, using natural methods to supplement chemical pesticides. We plant winter crops to replenish the soil naturally and we leave legume or grass strips in the fields and along fence lines to shelter wildlife. We do this even though we end up providing room and board for the animals we attract as they eat our crops. We do this voluntarily, without government threats or public thanks.

Our conservation compliance plans are complete. It is evident, very evident, that the environment has nothing to fear from farmers. We do care for the land because it cares for us. We don't care for environmental elitists—their rhetoric aimed at fund-raising and membership growth more than reason and rational progress. Let them rant, we'll plant. Let them accuse, we'll conserve and use—responsibly use—our God-given resources to benefit people. We'll continue to stand for conservation and challenge preservation.

And it appears the weather vane of public opinion is changing. Elitists fear that public support for three issues will gut their movement. One is the weighing of costs of risk prevention against the benefits, in any federal regulations. Another is a severe restriction on unfunded mandates imposed at the federal level on state and country governments, with these costs being passed on to us. And the third fear is compensation to landowners when their property values are lessened.

Elitists call these three issues the "Unholy Trinity." I call the three common sense for the common good. These issues go to the heart of many of the specific actions we took last year in the environmental area.

We worked for a law that strengthens trespass restraints against government agents involved with biological surveys. We also supported President Clinton's creation of an office of risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis and an independent national appeals division.

Farm Bureau and its leaders were instrumental in defeating attempts to hike grazing fees to unrealistic, unprofitable levels. We stalled consideration of a global biodiversity treaty until our specific concerns and complaints were addressed. We defeated an energy tax last year that would have cost farmers an average of 2,500 dollars each. We didn't want to be BTU'd.

We worked for sensible clean water rules, a common-sense wetlands definition. We sued to keep ethanol an important component of the EPA's clean air pollution reduction program. Despite significant progress in Congress and in public opinion, it was still necessary to go to court to protect farmers' and ranchers' interests.

One of our most recent and on-going lawsuits involves the federal government's scheme to put wolves into the Yellowstone Park area. The surrounding area is immense—half the state of Montana, 95 percent of Idaho and all of Wyoming would be considered wolf range. Federal efforts to protect the wolf under the Endangered Species Act would amount to a giant federal land-use plan for most of the residents of the three states.

First off, the wolf the government wants to put in the area isn't even endangered. There are thousands in Alaska and Minnesota and 70,000 of them in Canada. Second, the wolf they want to introduce is the Canadian gray wolf, not the Northern Rocky Mountain wolf that once roamed the area. Third, we object to the plan because the government didn't follow its own rules.

Fish and Wildlife ignored them. While they were supposed to be talking with area residents about the general idea, federal agents were instead building holding pens in the park to house the wolves.

Throughout the sham, government workers used questionable biological science to implement their own political decisions.

There are provisions allowing ranchers to protect livestock. As a New York Times article concluded a few days ago, "Ranchers will still be able to kill or harass wolves if they threaten livestock." That makes everybody feel really good, doesn't it?

But the official rules are composed in typical governmentese—Beltway babble—by people who don't have the slightest idea of real-world living. You could kill a wolf, but you've got to do it by the book.

First, you must catch the wolf in the act of killing, wounding or biting livestock. Killing one that you see working over a carcass isn't good enough because you couldn't prove that that wolf killed your animal. So you've got to see the wolf in action, killing.

There's a second restriction. If you kill a wolf, a fresh domesticated animal carcass must be on hand for the government to inspect. If it takes more than a day for you to ride in, report the taking, get the agent to your place and ride out to the attack site, forget it, you're in trouble.

Now those rules apply only if you kill a wolf on your own land. For those grazing federal land, it's even more contrived, more ridiculous.

Just like so many of our wetlands examples, so many of our endangered species examples, the stories are absurd. They're funny—until they happen to you or your neighbors or your fellow Farm Bureau members. Farm Bureau is working for you, right now, to put an end to such tales.

We've been involved in many more issues and activities. We developed a book to review farm program legislation options. We worked to strengthen the crop insurance program.

Whether it was in Congress or the courts, Farm Bureau was there representing agriculture's interests. But that is all old news.

What is Farm Bureau going to do next? What are you doing now? Ladies and gentlemen, Farm Bureau is poised for our greatest accomplishments ever. Farmers and ranchers have never had the opportunities we have now.

With the convening of the 104th Congress, Farm Bureau is ready to push for the acceptance of many of our most basic, our most fundamental principles. The first 100 days of this new Congress are extremely crucial. We must be prepared to act. We must work to create acceptance of our efforts by the politicians and opinion-makers. Farm Bureau members must push for the legislative implementation of our policies.

One item we've sought for a long time is a balanced budget amendment. We've had some successes. Many now in Congress said they would push for it. Let's push them.

Another crucial goal is granting the president a line-item veto. The Republicans supported it when they were in the minority and there were Republican presidents. Now that they're in control of Congress, Farm Bureau must work to make sure they are still so eager for it.

A third major goal would be a reduced capital gains tax, better yet a total elimination, the same as citizens of many developed countries enjoy. Do you know what Germans are taxed on capital gains? Zero. What about people in Hong Kong? Zero. Italians? Zero. South Koreans? Zero. Taiwanese? Zero.

Some countries do have a capital gains tax. Japan? Five percent. France? 16 percent. Even our social service-happy neighbors to the north only pay a maximum 17-and-a-half percent capital gains tax.

We'll work with Congress to cut the tax, cut it big-time. I'm convinced a significant cut will result in more tax revenues to the

government through the increased sales of appreciated assets. 10 or 15 percent of something is a lot more than 28 percent of nothing.

Another of our opportunities is an increased estate tax exemption. The 600,000 dollar exemption currently in the law hasn't been changed for a decade. We must work to obtain an exemption that will allow farm operations to pass from generation to generation with minimal disruption and dislocation.

A fifth area of opportunity would be obtaining legislation requiring risk assessment and cost/benefit analysis. A sixth is legislation limiting the creation of unfunded mandates.

And a seventh is granting compensation for victims of takings. That's the key in our private property battle. Make government pay for what they take and they'll take less or, better yet, they'll stop taking. Or, if they take, we get fair market value.

That's seven goals for us to shoot for, by Easter. And we'll work to get a 100 percent income tax deduction for health insurance premiums paid by the self-employed and adequate funding for new farm programs.

That will be enough on our plate for now, for these 100 days. Challenge and change. Opportunity and good fortune. The future is exciting. We are creating our own breaks. Better prosperity beckons. But there's more, much more.

Innovations overtake us with dizzying speed. And we accept and adapt them to our advantage. About the only thing old-fashioned about farmers today is our adherence to our traditional values.

I recently came across a paragraph from the Durants' 11-volume "Story of Civilization." I'll quote the paragraph, not the 11 volumes. "Civilization is a stream with banks. The stream is sometimes filled with blood from people killing, stealing, shouting and doing things historians usually record \* \* \* While on the banks, unnoticed, people build homes, make love, raise children, sing songs, write poetry and even whittle statues. The story of civilization is the story of what happened on the banks. Historians are pessimists because they ignore the banks for the river."

Sometimes, we get awfully close to being like those historians. Still, even though agriculture is so enmeshed in executive orders, legislation, regulations and court rulings, we know there's a lot more to life than making a living.

It's seeing seedlings push through the crust \* \* \* to unfold in a burst \* \* \* Green rows stretching to the horizon. It's seeing a cow nuzzle and nudge her calf, to stand on its own. It's going to Saturday night church service so on Sunday morning we can see dawn break and contemplate God from our deer stand. It's hurrying to finish chores so we can go to another Farm Bureau meeting. It's seeing the kids beam with pride as they see their hog take a fourth-place ribbon, even if there was only a class of four.

There's more to life than making a living. Winston Churchill said we make a living by what we get, but we make a life by what we give. We know life and we call it farming. And it's what Farm Bureau is all about. We work to preserve the ideals we cherish, the life that others only dream about.

You and I, working together, can keep this nation the country we want, the country we fought for, the country we will always fight for. Our future is bright because of our faith, our families and Farm Bureau.

As the country prepares for the 21st century, let us keep our principles in place for the 22nd. We face a different world, and you, working through Farm Bureau, can make a difference.

Thank you for the wonderful opportunity, the gift, of serving you. God bless you. God bless America. God bless Farm Bureau.

## CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

## CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 2, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2) to make certain laws applicable to the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Ford/Feingold amendment No. 4, to prohibit the personal use of accrued frequent flyer miles by Members and employees of the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Now pending before the Senate is amendment No. 4.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, we had this legislation on the floor last week, of course, and continue it today. We will continue it tomorrow. The time is limited on this.

I wanted to rise and let all the people watching in the offices, all the different staffs, as well as the individual Senators, know that it is my understanding—and I ask my distinguished colleague from Iowa to comment on this, too—it is my understanding that the majority leader has indicated that he wished to end this bill, if at all possible, by 7 o'clock tomorrow evening, Tuesday evening.

Now, I presume that is correct. I know we will try to end by a certain time. I was just told a few moments ago that the time expressed is 7 tomorrow evening.

That being the case, there are no amendments on the Republican side. They are all on the Democratic. If we are to meet that deadline, it means that people had better get their amendments together and get them over here. We have no time agreements at this point, so anyone can take up as much time as they want on the floor.

But we do have a number of amendments still pending, and if people expect to make certain of not getting frozen out with their proposals, then they better get over here this afternoon. We will have some tomorrow morning. But people should be cognizant of the fact that tomorrow is conference day also where we will be out of session temporarily, or in recess, from about 12:30 to 2:15, so we lose a block of time in the middle of the day.

As I see it right now, with the number of amendments still left, there is not going to be time for getting them all in right now even if people started

coming to the floor now. I hope people are not going to wait until late tomorrow afternoon and then bump up against the 7 o'clock deadline and then want the floor managers, Senator GRASSLEY and myself, to try to make some special arrangement for them, because that is not likely to be possible. I encourage people who have amendments to get them together, get them over here and consider them this afternoon while we have time. We have quite a bit of time. It is 20 minutes to 4. We can consider several amendments. We have nothing pending at the moment. I urge my Democratic colleagues to get them together and get over here. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, let us take a look at the amendments that might be brought up. I hope they will not all be brought up:

One by Senator BRYAN dealing with pensions. One by Senator BYRD that is described as a relevant amendment. We have four by Senator FEINSTEIN dealing with campaign finance reform. We have one by Senator FORD that is an amendment pending dealing with frequent flier miles. Also, another one described as a relevant amendment. We have a manager's amendment by our friend Senator GLENN. Senator GRAHAM, of Florida, has an amendment that is in the process of being drafted of which we have no description. Senator KERRY has an amendment dealing with leadership PAC's and campaign fund conversion for personal use. Senator LAUTENBERG has an amendment that is described as a relevant amendment. Senator LEAHY dealing with employment rights. Senator LEVIN, another one described as relevant. Senator REID, described as relevant. And Senator WELLSTONE has several, two that deal with gift ban, three that deal with campaign finance reform, one with health care, and two described as relevant.

I think that anybody in this body or anybody listening throughout the country would probably realize that each of these amendments, at least those that we have a description of, are legitimate subjects for discussion within this body. Most of them—not all of them—but most of them have already been alluded to by the Senate majority leader by his saying that before just a few short months are up, all of these issues will be discussed. The issue of gifts and the issue of lobbying reform have all been described by Senator DOLE, the majority leader, as issues that he intends to give any Member of this body an opportunity to go as in-depth as they want to on any of these issues.

So there is not any issue on this set of pending amendments that will not have an opportunity to be discussed; in other words, it will have an opportunity to be discussed the first half of this year, for sure.